



MEETING SUMMARY

CALIFORNIA WATER PLAN UPDATE 2013
INTEGRATED FLOOD MANAGEMENT OBJECTIVE
NOON – 1:00 P.M.
815 S STREET, SACRAMENTO, CA

Meeting Objectives

Discuss and suggest revisions for the Related Actions associated with the Update 2013 Objective relating to Integrated Flood Management (IFM):

“Promote and practice flood management using an integrated water management (IWM) approach that reduces flood risk to people and property while maintaining and enhancing natural floodplain functions. This IWM approach utilizes a systemwide perspective and considers all aspects of water management including public safety, environmental sustainability, water supply reliability, water quality, emergency management, resiliency, and economic stability.”

Welcome, Introductions and Agenda Review

The Update 2013 Objectives Web-a-thon was held on June 13-14, 2013 to discuss the draft 17 Objectives and the associated Related Action for the Water Plan. Introductions were made around the room and online. Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR, Manager, Statewide Integrated Water Management Branch, welcomed everyone and noted that an online wrap up session will be conducted on July 9th, to conclude any items needing additional discussion. He explained that the workbook was prepared by DWR staff and subject matter experts, and is for discussion purposes only. The first few pages of this draft document provide definitions of terms and the Water Plan mission, vision and goals – which sets the context for the objectives and related actions. A brief review of the IFM objective and related actions (found on pages 19-22 of the workbook) would be followed by discussion on the text. This item will be continued on July 9, 2013.

Overview

Jose Alarcon, DWR Project Team, provided brief background on how the objectives and related actions were developed. He and Francisco Guzman have reviewed the 37 Featured State Plans, related state agency plans with bearing on the Water Plan, and correlated the respective recommendations with the Water Plan objectives. These were forwarded to the subject matter experts for consideration in updating the related actions for each objective. Collectively, the objectives identify what is needed to accomplish the goals of the Water Plan. The related actions represent what is needed to accomplish each particular objective. He noted that the workbook also contains a column for performance measures, which will help track each action and inform the next Water Plan Progress Report. Draft measures have been proposed for some of the objectives, and feedback is also welcomed on potential performance measures.



Document Walk Through

Terri Wegener, DWR, Manager, Statewide Flood Management, reviewed the IFM Objective and related actions. She observed that several of the featured plans for Update 2013 focus on flood management. These include the Flood Future Report (FFR), Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP) and the Delta Plan. The IFM Objective draws upon the recommendations of these three plans, to provide consistency across all plans.

Related Actions

The proposed Related Actions, and the ensuing discussion, are presented below. Please note that the actions below have been abridged from the original text and the sub-actions are not included:

General Discussion

- One way to pare down the detail, it to provide text that sets up the recommendation. E.g. Point to text in other sections of the Water Plan that provide the context. The Objectives should point to the chapters or Resource Management Strategies (RMSs).
 - Objectives can have 5-10 related actions. Details that should be elevated could be developed into stand-alone actions.
 - In the objective, last sentence, should this say State government or DWR? Say “DWR should take the lead, and collaboration with other agencies, ...”
 - Augmenting language would need to be consistent with the RMS and not inconsistent with the FFR (or other plan).
 - Add letters to identify sub-actions. (Remove letters at the end of sub-actions for Action #2.)
 - Actions and sub-actions need to identify responsible party.
-
1. The State should take the lead in working Federal and local flood management and resource agencies to undertake various activities. Item #a: Update the Flood Future Report by 2018. Item #b: Conduct regional flood risk assessments. Item #c: Increase public awareness about flood risk. Item #d: Support flood emergency preparedness, response, and recovery plans (improve flood forecasting, conduct exercises, improve emergency plans, increase coordination). Item #e: Encourage land use planning that reduces the consequences of flood (develop best management practices, promote coordination, fund implementation efforts). Item #f: Collaborate across multiple levels to identify and prioritize local projects and improve coordination. Item #g: Form regional working teams to address permitting, planning, priority setting, and implementation. Item #h: Improve access to financing information; assess financing options; propose new financing strategies.

Objectives Web-a-thon Practice Integrated Flood Management June 14, 2013



Discussion:

- This action is drawn from the FFR recommendation and implementation actions.
- This is a good goal – there may be too much amalgamation. It's not clear which entities are responsible for which items. Also, in terms of performance measures, it can be difficult to track actions with multiple items.
 - Provide more detail, creating sub-bullets
 - Some bullets do not accurately reflect what was contained in the FFR.
- There are two strategies from the FFR that are not reflected in this action: identify opportunities to restore and maintain natural systems; and assist agencies in assessing the impacts of climate change and sea-level rise. Recommendation #4 was perhaps intended to capture that, but there are significant changes in wording and strength. The flavor is missing with the words, "where feasible." Regarding climate change, the FFR says that climate change and sea-level rise must be developed and made available to public agencies. This is much stronger than the wording for Action #4 which says "should consider the impacts."
 - Suggest using the original FFR language for these two elements.
- Item a: If the FFR was updated in 2017, it could be more easily integrated into Update 2018 of the Water Plan. Conversely, the FFR rolls up information from the CVFPP which will be released in 2017.
- Item c: There were two strategies from the FFR that are not reflected here: provide tools and templates to local agencies; and providing online information about flood. The current language seems a bit too general.
- Item e: If recharge could be incorporated here, that might be appropriate.
- Item e: Is there a list land use BMPs? Are the BMPs in the RMS? (Response: Not that's been vetted.) Are these Best Management Planning Principles or Best Management Practices? (Need to clarify.)
- Item e: Link to the Land Use Related Actions which are stronger than saying "encourage." (Provide cross-references.)
- Item f: There a specific strategy from the FFR – identify regional flood planning areas. This took a lot of work, made it into the FFR, but it's not here. Also, the idea of collaboratives was not in the FFR – not sure what this means. Another strategy recommended linking funding to an IRWM approach. (This may have been moved to the finance related actions.) This is not about more funds, but links funds for IRWM to flood.
- Item f: Do we want the collaboratives to identify and prioritize only local projects? Or should they also look at regional and inter-regional priorities?

Objectives Web-a-thon Practice Integrated Flood Management June 14, 2013



- Add a bullet to Related Action #1: Develop broad-based public funding for fish and wildlife enhancement and to provide recreational opportunities at federal and state flood control projects as required by WC 12841. (Rationale: Since these public purposes are required and benefit all Californians, they need a separate funding source from local beneficiary assessments. Not having a state source of funding can hold up projects, similar to the Perris Dam problem.)
2. The State should implement the Central Valley Flood Protection Plan (CVFPP).

Item #a: Update the CVFPP in years ending in 2 and 7. Item #b: Continue to plan and refine physical improvement to the State Plan of Flood Control. Item #c: Periodically update the Flood Control System Status Report. Item #d: Assist local entities in the Central Valley to make findings related to the urban level of flood protection. Item #e: Support flood management projects using an IWM approach. Item #f: Support wise management of floodplains protected by the State Plan of Flood Control.

Discussion:

- This builds on the recommendations of the CVFPP.
 - Item 2: The adoption of the updates occurs in years ending in 2 and 7.
3. The State should support implementation of the Delta Plan.
- Item #a: Establish a Delta Flood Risk Management Assessment District with fee assessment authority. Item #b: Evaluate a floodway and bypass on the San Joaquin River, near Paradise Cut. Item #c: Evaluate designation of floodplains within and upstream of the Delta, and include climate change considerations. Item #d: Develop criteria to define locations of setback levees in the Delta and Delta watershed. Item #e: Require adequate levels of flood insurance for all structures in floodprone areas. Item #f: Consider statutory and/or constitutional changes to address the State's potential flood liability, including agency immunity. Item #g: The US Army Corps of Engineers should consider a variance that exempts Delta levees from their levee vegetation policy.

Discussion:

- These actions are based on recommendations from the flood sections of the Delta Plan.
- Item a: The responsible party is the Legislature.
- Item b discusses a very site-specific project. Is this consistent with what the overall approach of the Water Plan? The project here represents a place, a policy, and a function that is desired. It represents a point of view, planning approach and solution set. (Check this. Any trigger of CEQA? The Delta Plan did conduct CEQA.)

Objectives Web-a-thon Practice Integrated Flood Management June 14, 2013



- Item e: Who is requiring adequate levels of flood insurance? What can government entities do about this?
- The last three bullets seem more general in nature, and don't seem to tie directly to the Delta Plan.
 - The flood insurance requirement was tied specifically to the Delta and was recommended by the Delta Vision process. There are local government powers through the ordinance that can require the insurance. The idea is to limit the State's liability. It would probably be required by local jurisdictions. This might be truncated from what's in the plan.
 - The flood insurance item in the Delta Plan reads as follows: "The Legislature should require an adequate level of flood insurance for residences, businesses, and industries in floodprone areas."
- 4. Communities implementing flood management projects should, where feasible, evaluate and incorporate alternatives that protect, maintain, or improve utilization of floodplains, including use of setback levees, riparian habitats and reconnecting rivers and streams with their natural flood plains, as well as better utilize natural floodplain processes. These evaluations should consider the impacts of sea-level rise and climate change.

Discussion:

- This action focuses on environmental stewardship and floodplain management.
- There is an opportunity for improving groundwater recharge here, and adding that to the list.
- This item will be continued on July 9th.

Next Steps

This item will be continued on July 9th. There is a flood conference that precludes some stakeholders from participating. There are some concerns that environmental considerations are not fully reflected in this objective.



Attendance

In Room

Dave Bolland, Association of California Water Agencies
Al Herson, American Planning Association
Mick Klasson, Environmental Planner
Karl Longley, California Water Institute, UC Fresno
Bob Siegfried, Carmel Area Wastewater District

Jose Alarcon, DWR, Water Quality Lead
Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR, Manager, Statewide Integrated Water Management
Lewis Moeller, DWR, Water Plan Project Manager
Elizabeth Patterson, DWR, Land Use Lead
Terri Wegener, DWR, Manager, Statewide Flood Management

Lisa Beutler, MWH, Water Plan Executive Facilitator
Judie Talbot, CCP, Facilitator

Webinar

Jami Childress, California Emergency Management Agency
Anisa Divine, Imperial Irrigation District
Cheryl Essex, State Parks
Max Gomberg, State Water Board (Climate Change)
Bruce Gwynne, Department of Conservation
Zia Hosseini, Ventura County Watershed Protection District
Anne Lynch, CH2MHill
Margie Namba, Granite Construction
Chris Potter, California Resources Agency (Ocean Grants and Wetlands)
Tony St. Amant, Water Policy Advocate
Mark Stadler, San Diego County Water Authority
Megan Walton, California Emergency Management Agency
Marsha Westropp, Orange County Water District
Emilia Wisniewski, East Bay Municipal Utility District
Betty Yee, Central Valley Regional Water Board

Todd Hillaire, DWR, Chief, Flood Management
Salomon Miranda, DWR, Floodplain Management
Maury Roos, DWR, Chief Hydrologist